

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/773,568	02/02/2001	Takashi Kobayashi	500.39508X00	7127	
20457	7590 10/27/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800			BULLOCK JR, LEV	BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ARLINGTON	I, VA 22209-9889		2127		
		•	DATE MAILED: 10/27/2004	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



				/ \			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	\mathcal{G}			
		09/773,568	KOBAYASHI ET	KOBAYASHI ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.	2127				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication reply	n appears on the cover sheet	t with the correspondence ac	ddress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicative a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days begin period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory care to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, mayon. , a reply within the statutory minimum of period will apply and will expire SIX (6) No statute, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered time MONTHS from the mailing date of this of e ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>09 July 2002</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5) <u>□</u> 6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>6 and 7</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>6 and 7</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	hdrawn from consideration.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)] accepted or b) ☐ objected	to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection t	o the drawing(s) be held in abe	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	·			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c The oath or declaration is objected to by the						
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bustee the attached detailed Office action for the second se	ments have been received. ments have been received in priority documents have be ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National	Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)						
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)				
3) 🔲 Inforr	ee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S r No(s)/Mail Date		No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PT0	O-152)			

Art Unit: 2127

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAITO (U.S. Patent 6,032,124) in view of FLORES (U.S. Patent 6,073,109).

As to claim 6, SAITO teaches a system for cooperating a workflow, comprising: a task template (template of BP definitions) including a business process model and a data model, the business process model (BP definition) defining a task group and a task execution procedure (defines the nodes that process and transmit data), the data model defining data input/output information (entrance node and exit nodes and their compatibility / BP connection data) (col. 3, lines 9-25; col. 4, lines 28-66; col. 5, lines 8-51; col. 6, lines 17-34); a task execution management unit (document management unit) which indicates a task to be executed according to the business process model in the task template(col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 27); a task start instruction unit which sends an execution start signal to a business application for executing the task in response to the indication from the task execution management unit (send document to entrance node) (col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 27; col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 6); a task completion detection unit which detects a signal indicating that the business application has completed the task (col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 27); a task result obtaining unit which

Art Unit: 2127

obtains information indicative of an executed result of the task (retrieve results) (col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 27); and a plan information notification unit which informs the business applications of the processed result (notifying other processing units of the retrieved results) (col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 27). However, SAITO does not teach that the system notifying external nodes performs conversion of the workflow to the multiple business applications based upon conversion rules.

FLORES teaches a system for cooperating a general killer application (Workflow manager / workflow application builder) executing a plan management process (workflow) and having a predetermined specification with multiple business applications (workflow enabled applications) by sending task to the business applications (applications) and converting the information according to an information conversion rule (syntactical definition) and delivers the information to the killer application, the information conversion rule defining relations between the data model relating to the killer application and data models relating to the business applications (col. 10, lines 29-60; col. 11, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of SAITO with the teachings of FLORES in order to allow applications to act and participate in business processes and enable managers to observe and query the status of workflows and business processes (col. 3, lines 30-37).

As to claim 7, reference is made to a method that corresponds to the system of claim 6 and is therefore met by the rejection of claim 6 above.

Art Unit: 2127

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3759. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2127

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

October 25, 2004

LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.